

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/652,252	09/02/2003	Sakayu Shimizu	0042-0485P	1858
2292 75	90 03/22/2006		EXAMINER	
	ART KOLASCH & BI	PRATS, FRANCISCO CHANDLER		
PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			1651	
			DATE MAIL ED: 03/22/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/652,252	SHIMIZU ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Francisco C. Prats	1651	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	e correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDO	ON. e timely filed om the mailing date of this communication. NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, p		
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 1-13 are subject to restriction and/or experiments. 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the oregin contents.	vn from consideration. election requirement. r. epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. S	See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicative documents have been received in Received in PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ation No ived in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summa Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informa 6) Other:		

U.S. Patent and Tredemark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 7-05) Art Unit: 1651

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-13 are presented for examination.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1, 3, 5, and 7-9, drawn to a method of preparing 2-deoxyribose-5-phosphate from glyceraldehyde-3-phosphate, classified in class 435, subclass 105.
- II. Claims 2, 4, 6, and 10-12, drawn to a method of preparing 2-deoxyribose-5-phosphate from dihydroxyacetone phosphate (DHAP), classified in class 435, subclass 105.
- III. Claim 13, drawn to Klebsiella pneumoniae B-44, classified in class 435, subclass 252.1.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions III is related to inventions I and II as product and processes of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as

claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the product, a microorganism, can be used in materially different processes, such as the recombinant production of multiple copies

of DNA encoding the genes of the enzymes used herein, or in

processes of producing said enzymes.

Page 3

Although there are no provisions under the section for "Relationship of Inventions" in MPEP § 806.05 for inventive groups that are directed to different methods, restriction is considered to be proper because the following methods constitute patentably distinct inventions for the following reasons:

Groups I and II are directed to methods that are distinct both functionally and physically, and are not required one for the other. Specifically, the two groups require the use of different steps and starting materials. Therefore, a search and examination of all methods in one patent application would result in an undue burden, since the searches for the methods are not co-extensive, the classification is different, and the subject matter is divergent.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be

Application/Control Number: 10/652,252

Art Unit: 1651

traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must

Art Unit: 1651

be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Page 5

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Francisco C. Prats whose telephone number is 571-272-0921. The examiner

Application/Control Number: 10/652,252

Art Unit: 1651

can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, with alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Wityshyn can be reached on 571-272-0926. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-tree)

Francisco C. Prats Primary Examiner Art Unit 1651 Page 6

FCP